

MC - 11/3/95
061 - 11/2/95

Patent

Attorney's Docket No. 024703-006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

Kamiyama et al.

Group Art Unit: 1102

Application No.: 08/174,957 ✕

Examiner: Leader, W.

Filed: December 28, 1993 ✓

For: METHOD FOR SURFACE
TREATMENT OF ALUMINUM
HIGH-TEMPERATURE
PROCESSED ARTICLES

RECEIVED
FEB - 8 AM 7:46
GROUP 110

AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Box AF
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

Applicants submit the following amendment in response to the Office Action mailed on November 2, 1995.

In the Claims

Please cancel Claims 18-28.

Please amend Claims 1, 10 and 17 follows:

1. (Amended) A method for treating the surface of an aluminum alloy high-temperature processed article, comprising heating an aluminum alloy containing Mg at a high temperature of 200° or above, etching the surface with an aqueous solution

C1 containing a chelating agent wherein the aqueous solution consists of a solution having a pH of 7 or higher, and then carrying out hydration oxidation treatment.

C2 10. (Amended) The method according to claim [9] 1, wherein said chelating agent is in a concentration of from 0.005 mol/lit to 0.5 mol/lit.

Sub D2
C3 17. (Amended) A method for treating the surface of an aluminum alloy high-pressure processed article, comprising heating an aluminum alloy containing Mg at a high temperature of 200° or above, etching the surface with an aqueous solution containing a chelating agent wherein the aqueous solution consists of a solution having a pH of 7 or higher, and then carrying out at least one surface treatment selected from the group consisting of hydration oxidation treatment, coating type chromating, anodizing, alternating current electrolysis in an aqueous alkali solution, and coating.

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 17 have been amended to include the limitation that in the etching step, the aqueous solution consists of an aqueous solution having a pH of 7 or higher. Support for this amendment is found, for example, in the first full paragraph on page 8. Claim 10 has been amended so as to be dependent on claim 1 instead of claim 9.

Examiner rejected claims 1, 7-15 and 17-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Lowenheim. As noted in the previous